

## REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

In the Office action mailed August 10, 2009, claims 1 – 3, 5, 7, 10, and 13 were rejected and claims 4, 6, 8, 9, 11, 12, and 14 were objected to. Applicants point out that claims 7 and 10 are not directly addressed. In response, Applicants have amended claims 1 and 13 and canceled claim 2. Applicants hereby request reconsideration of the application in view of the amendments and the below-provided remarks. No claims are added.

### Allowable Subject Matter

Applicants appreciate the Examiner's review of the claims and determination that claims 4, 6, 8, 9, 11, 12, and 14 recite allowable subject matter. In particular, the Office Action states that claims 4, 6, 8, 9, 11, 12, and 14 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims. Applicants have not rewritten the claims at this time in view of the below-provided remarks.

### Claim Rejections under 35 U.S.C. 102 and 103

Claims 1, 3, 5, and 13 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Walczak et al. (U.S. Pat. No. 5,818,348, hereinafter Walczak). Additionally, claim 2 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Walczak in view of Meier (EP 0805575, hereinafter Meier). However, Applicants respectfully submit that these claims are patentable over Walczak and Meier for the reasons provided below.

### Claim 1

Claim 1 has been amended to particularly point out that the “check data block” is a “CRC check data block.” Support for the amendment is found in Applicants' specification at, for example, paragraph [0032] and Fig. 3 (U.S. Pub. No. 2006/0077043 A1). As amended, claim 1 recites:

“A method of recognizing whether a transponder designed for communicating with a communication station belongs to one of at least two groups of transponders under which method the communication station designed for communicating with the transponder delivers a request signal to the transponder, which request signal comprises a command data block and a CRC check data block, and under which method, data contained in the request signal is evaluated in the transponder in order to recognize whether the transponder belongs to a group of transponders,

wherein, for each group of transponders, a CRC check data block that is significant for the group of transponders is generated, and

wherein the data that is evaluated for the recognition of whether the transponder belongs to a group of transponders is data from the CRC check data block that is significant for the group of transponders.” (emphasis added)

That is, claim 1 recites that a CRC check data block in a request signal is used to determine if a transponder belongs to a particular group of transponders.

Walczak discloses a query frame (600) that has an information sequence block (604) and a check sequence block (606). In particular, Walczak discloses:

“FIG. 6, numeral 600, is a diagram of a preferred embodiment of a query frame in accordance with the present invention. The query frame includes an initialization sequence (602) with a dotting pattern and sync pattern, at least one information sequence (604), and at least one check sequence (606). The first information sequence (604) of the query frame includes a transponder group type and a frame identifier (ID).

The transponder group type identifies the group, classification, or vendor. A typical group type is 16 bits long. The frame identifier differentiates a query from a command. A typical frame identifier for a query frame is a single bit set to 1.” (col. 4, lines 35 – 47) (emphasis added)

That is, Walczak discloses that the information sequence block (604) includes data that is significant for a group of transponders. Walczak does not disclose that the information sequence block (604) is a CRC check data block. Additionally, Walczak does not disclose that the check sequence block (606) includes data that is significant for a group of transponders. With respect to the check sequence block (606), Walczak discloses no other purpose except for reliability checking, see for example, col. 3, lines 24 – 37.

Because the information sequence block (604) of Walczak is not a CRC data block and because Walczak does not disclose that the check sequence block (606) includes data that is significant for a group of transponders, Applicants assert that amended claim 1 is not anticipated by Walczak.

Additionally, the Office action cites Meier as teaching that a start value for a CRC data block is programmable. However, Applicants assert that Meier does not teach a group-significant CRC check data block as recited in amended claim 1. At page 4, lines 36 – 43, Meier teaches that start values of a CRC generator can be programmed. However, nowhere does Meier teach or suggest that the start values should be programmed as group-significant start values that are each assigned to a different group of transponders. Because Meier does not teach or suggest group-significant start values, Applicants assert that Meier does not teach or suggest a group-significant CRC check data block as recited in amended claim 1. Therefore, Applicants assert that amended claim 1 is patentable over Walczak in view of Meier.

#### Claims 2 – 14

Claims 2 – 14 depend from and incorporate all of the limitations of claim 1. Applicants respectfully assert that claims 2 – 14 are allowable at least based on an allowable claim 1.

Claim 13 has been amended to particularly point out that the “check data block” is a “CRC check data block,” similar to claim 1. Support for the amendment is found in Applicants’ specification at, for example, paragraph [0032] and Fig. 3 (U.S. Pub. No. 2006/0077043 A1). Applicants assert that the limitations of amended claim 13 are not taught or suggested by Walczak or Meier.

## CONCLUSION

Applicants respectfully request reconsideration of the claims in view of the amended claims, the new claims, and the remarks made herein. A notice of allowance is earnestly solicited.

At any time during the pendency of this application, please charge any fees required or credit any over payment to Deposit Account **50-4019** pursuant to 37 C.F.R. 1.25. Additionally, please charge any fees to Deposit Account **50-4019** under 37 C.F.R. 1.16, 1.17, 1.19, 1.20 and 1.21.

Respectfully submitted,

/mark a. wilson/

Date: November 6, 2009

Mark A. Wilson  
Reg. No. 43,994

Wilson & Ham  
PMB: 348  
2530 Berryessa Road  
San Jose, CA 95132  
Phone: (925) 249-1300  
Fax: (925) 249-0111